

John J. Buchanan who is retiring after serving as Alderman for the 10th Ward in the City of Chicago for over 20 years.

Alderman Buchanan is a life-long resident and public servant of the 10th Ward. Alderman Buchanan attended St. Patrick's Grammar School and St. Francis de Sales High School, where he graduated as class Valedictorian. The only time Alderman Buchanan left the community was during his service in the U.S. Navy. After his service to our country, Alderman Buchanan returned to the 10th Ward and married his high school sweetheart, Lorraine Halbe. Alderman Buchanan and his wife have two children and five grandchildren.

Alderman Buchanan's knowledge of business and industry comes from his richly diverse work background. At the age of 13, he was already working after school at Gassman's, a well-known men's store on Commerical Avenue. His work experiences include positions at the Aluminum Company of America, the U.S. Post Office and the Chicago Board of Education. Alderman Buchanan is also a licensed Stationary Engineer and has both a real estate broker's license and an insurance broker's license. It is probably Alderman Buchanan's experience as an insurance salesman that opened doors to his deeper understanding of the needs of the community. This path eventually led the Alderman to a life in the public arena.

Alderman Buchanan was first elected to office in 1963 and served the community until 1971. From 1972 until 1977, he served as a Coordinator of Economic Development for the Chicago Mayor's Office. While in this position, he successfully instituted programs for the retention and attraction of new business and industry. In 1991, Alderman Buchanan was once again elected to serve as Alderman of the 10th Ward in the City of Chicago. His City Council Committee memberships included Aviation; Budget and Government Relations; Rules and Ethics; Economic and Capital Development; Finance, Human Relations; Police and Fire.

In honor of Alderman Buchanan's distinguished career, I have introduced federal legislation to change the name of the Hegewish Post Office to John J. Buchanan U.S. Post Office. I am also pleased to report that at my request, every member of the Illinois Congressional Delegation has agreed to support this legislation.

My Speaker, I urge this body to identify and recognize others in their own districts whose careers and actions have so greatly benefited and strengthened America's communities.

A TRIBUTE TO BROOKLYN PRIDE

HON. ANTHONY D. WEINER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1999

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to invite my colleagues to pay tribute to Brooklyn Pride on the occasion of its Spring Gala.

This event is not only a festive happening, it is a chance for all of us to celebrate and pay tribute to a group of individuals who embody the spirit of independence and community activism. This year's honorees truly represent the best of what our community has to offer.

Joo-Hyun Kang is the Executive Director of the Audre Lorde Project. Before coming to the

Audre Lorde Project, Joo-Hyun was the Program Coordinator for Women's Rights at the Women's Environment and Development Organization, an international women's organization founded by the late Bella Abzug. She has been active in various struggles for justice, particularly those addressing concerns related to women of color and to the gay and lesbian community.

Regina Shavers is the Program Director and founding Board member of the Griot Circle, the only Senior Center committed to affirming the lives of seniors in the gay and lesbian community. She is currently employed by the New York City Department of Health's HIV Training Institute as a training supervisor and serves as a Literacy Tutor at the Bedford Learning Center.

Continuing her family's tradition of community activism, Regina became an advocate for workers' rights while working for the New York City Police Department as a supervisor in their Communications Division Training Unit. Regina has also served as the Co-Chair of DC 37's Lesbian and Gay Issues Committee and served on the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) Lesbian and Gay Rights National Advisory Board. An active member of Brooklyn Pride, Regina was an integral member of the city-wide coalition that negotiated with the City of New York to insure Domestic Partner benefits for all New York City employees.

Alan Fleishman is a lifelong Brooklyn resident who has lived in Park Slope for the last fifteen years. He has been an organizer in the lesbian and gay community and has served as the President of the Lambda Independent Democrats and the Gay Friends and Neighbors. Alan currently advises New York City Comptroller Hevesi on matters concerning the lesbian and gay community as well as on HIV/AIDS issues and concerns. Mr. Fleishman has been honored by the Central Brooklyn Independent Democrats, the Paul Robeson Independent Democrats and the Brooklyn AIDS Task Force for his organizing work in Brooklyn.

All of today's honorees have long been known as innovators and beacons of good will to all those with whom they come into contact. Through their dedicated efforts, they have each helped to improve my constituents' quality of life. In recognition of their many accomplishments on behalf of my constituents, I offer my congratulations on their being honored by Brooklyn Pride.

INTRODUCTION OF THE PATIENT EMPOWERMENT ACT OF 1999

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1999

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to introduce the Patient Empowerment Act of 1999, the second in a series of Medicare modernization bills designed to improve program administration and the quality of health care for Medicare beneficiaries.

Mr. Speaker, Medicare beneficiaries currently have little or no control over their health care decisions. Instead of choosing the most appropriate course of treatment for their particular circumstance, some patients are being

told what they should do based on an oversupply of hospital resources or physician specialists in their area. Many diseases have several treatment options available. In most cases, there is no evidence to suggest that one course of treatment is better than another.

Dr. John Wennberg, one of the world's most renowned health policy researchers, talks about this issue in the 1998 Dartmouth Atlas: "The greater the per capita supply of hospital resources, the greater will be their per capita use, and the greater the per capita expenditures." The Atlas provides overwhelming statistical proof that in the economics of health care, supply often drives demand.

Dr. Wennberg estimates that if Medicare spending for all hospital referral regions with higher rates were brought down to the level of spending in the Minneapolis region (considered a very high quality of care region), Medicare's financial problems would be solved.

Many costly hospital stays could be averted entirely if Medicare beneficiaries were fully informed about their treatment alternatives. Not surprisingly, when presented with the range of available options, patients will often choose less invasive treatments.

For example, treatment of benign prostatic hyperplasia, a common condition affecting the majority of men over the age of 65, ranges from surgical removal to watchful waiting. Each of the options raises a number of trade-offs: while surgery is the most effective way to deal with symptoms, undergoing surgery presents certain risks. In Wennberg's analysis, most men with mild symptoms choose watchful waiting when educated about the full range of options, and watchful waiting is clearly the least expensive of all the options.

Patients have long deferred their medical decisions to their physicians. But medical care is becoming increasingly complex, and improvements in health technology have led to a multitude of available treatments. The treatment they choose should reflect the personal values and lifestyles of the patient and their family.

Therefore, I am introducing a demonstration bill to give patients more power over their health decisions. The findings from these demonstrations could lead to ways to greatly reduce the cost of the Medicare program, without jeopardizing health outcomes. I strongly urge members to support this legislation.

EDUCATION FLEXIBILITY PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1999

SPEECH OF

HON. DENNIS J. KUCINICH

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, April 21, 1999

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, I support the concept of flexibility in the way that our federal education programs are implemented at the state and local level. Local Educational Agencies and individual schools need flexibility to ensure that our programs are conducted in a manner that is responsive and relevant to local conditions and the divergent needs of all students. However, educational flexibility needs to be viewed in its proper context—specifically in terms of the reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. In this context the Conference Report on H.R.

800, the Ed-Flex legislation, falls short and I rise to oppose the Conference Report.

I am a member of the House Education and Workforce Committee, and this Committee has just begun to take up the numerous important issues that are involved in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act. It is folly, Mr. Speaker, for this final version of the Ed-Flex bill to come up before the ESEA has even been considered. How can we justify creating a system in which all states can have the option to waive federal education requirements when those federal education programs have not even been reauthorized? It is inappropriate and unjustified for the Congress to be granting across-the-board waiver authority to states before the House Education and Workforce Committee has reconsidered the ESEA.

In fact, the Conference Report on H.R. 800 is actually weaker than the version that was passed by the House of Representatives. At least our House version of the bill contained a sunset provision that mandated that Ed-Flex be taken up during the ESEA reauthorization process. The Conference Report eliminates this provision.

Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, accountability must not be sacrificed for the sake of flexibility. If the Congress grants greater flexibility to the states, the states must be held responsible to use these new powers in a way that improves educational quality and student performance. The Conference Report is weak on accountability provisions. We tried to strengthen these accountability provisions in Committee, but were not successful. Now the Congress has placed itself in a position that will grant huge loopholes to states and localities when it comes to measuring and enforcing accountability. This is another reason why I urge my colleagues to oppose the Ed-Flex Conference Report.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned that the long-term effect of Ed-Flex will be to shift valuable federal resources away from schools in high-poverty neighborhoods towards schools in more wealthy districts. It is a hallmark of national education policy that federal funds be used to benefit schools and school districts that are most in need of outside resources. Federal programs need to be targeted to the disadvantaged. It is very possible that this bill will open the way for states to redirect ESEA Title I funds away from the disadvantaged. This trend dilutes the essential purposes of Title I. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the Ed-Flex Conference Report.

AUTHORIZING AWARDING OF GOLD MEDAL TO ROSA PARKS

SPEECH OF

HON. ROBERT C. SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, April 20, 1999

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 573, a bill to bestow a Congressional gold medal to Rosa Parks for her contributions to civil rights in the United States of America.

Rosa Parks and her contribution to the current American way of life, by today's standard involved a very simple act. However, that simple act, Mr. Speaker, proved to have some very extraordinary consequences.

In 1955, Jim Crow segregation was the law of the land. African Americans by law were not allowed to share public accommodations with Whites. We couldn't eat in the same restaurants, couldn't live in the same neighborhoods and we were relegated to sit in the back seats of a public bus. If the white only section of the bus became full, we had to give up our seats when told to do so.

Nevertheless, in 1955, on December 1st in Montgomery, Alabama, Mrs. Parks with one very simple act of civil defiance changed that practice and the course of American History. On that day Mrs. Parks refused to give her seat to a White patron when told to do so by a Montgomery Bus driver. In spite of that bus driver's insistence, and knowing the certain consequences of her actions, she chose not to give up her seat. The police took her off the bus, arrested and jailed her. Mrs. Parks was later released on a one hundred-dollar bond.

Mr. Speaker, I suspect the city fathers of Montgomery initially never thought twice about that one simple act on that day in December. In response to Mrs. Parks' arrest, the black citizens of Montgomery began a bus boycott that lasted for 381 days. Led by a young local minister named Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., the Montgomery bus boycott helped to unravel the fabric of the South's social, economic and political culture of "Jim Crow" segregation.

This occasion has personal relevance to me also, Mr. Speaker. More than 40 years ago, during her brief tenure at Hampton University, I met Mrs. Parks. She worked there with my grandmother and I can well remember being struck by how unassuming and graceful she was, particularly in light of her role as a courageous civil rights pioneer.

Throughout the history of our nation, simple acts such as refusing to give up a seat on a bus as Rosa Parks did, often touch off a national movement that changes the course of history. This, Mr. Speaker, was one of those occasions and for this simple act, this House has taken the first step towards commemorating this demonstration of courage by Mrs. Parks and celebrating its tremendous impact.

I look forward, as many of my colleagues do, to the swift enactment of this resolution so that Mrs. Parks can receive the recognition she deserves from Congress.

ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATORY ISSUES

HON. RON PAUL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, April 22, 1999

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commend the insight added to the policy debate on critical environmental regulatory issues by John McClaughry in an article he authored in yesterday's Washington Times. Mr. McClaughry succinctly highlights the danger which occurs when, as happened in the United States in the late 1800's and early 1900's, property rights are ignored in the name of "progress."

Mr. McClaughry, president of Vermont's Ethan Allen Institute, correctly explains that technological innovation is stunted when the legal system allows polluters to externalize their costs without allowing legal recourse by those whose property is polluted.

I commend the research of Mr. McClaughry and thank him for his important contribution to

the policy debate regarding environmental regulation and recommend a careful reading of his article by everyone genuinely interested in both the proper moral and economic resolution of these issues.

CELEBRATING THE RESOURCEFUL EARTH

Tomorrow, many Americans will celebrate the 30th anniversary of Earth Day. The event was created in 1970 to call attention to humankind's despoliation of our planet. It's a good time to see what 30 years of Earth Day enthusiasm has given us.

The environmental awareness stimulated by the first Earth Day has had many beneficial results. Thanks to citizen awareness and ensuing state and national legislation, today the air is much cleaner, the water far purer, and risk from toxic and hazardous wastes sharply reduced. Polluters have been made to pay for disposal costs previously imposed on the public. Private groups like the Nature Conservancy have purchased and conserved millions of acres of land and natural resources.

But—and it always seems there is a but—like every promising new movement, the people who became leaders of the environmental movement stimulated by Earth Day soon found they could increase their political power (and staff salaries) by constantly demanding more command and control regulation. That heavyhanded government response has increasingly surpassed the boundaries of science and reason and severely strained the good will of millions of Americans who had eagerly responded to the initial call to clean up and protect our planet.

Here are just some of the "achievements" of an environmental movement that has flourished by promoting fantastic environmental scares, sending out millions of pieces of semihysterical direct mail fundraising letters, peddling junk science, and making ever-more-collusive legal deals.

A failed Endangered Species Act which, by substituting "ecosystem" control for species protection incentives, has caused thousands of landowners to drive off or exterminate the very species that were supposed to be protected.

A wetlands protection program that has gone from controlling real wetlands to regulating buffer zones around tiny "vernal pools" of spring snow melt, and even lands that have no water on them at all, but feature "hydric soils."

An air quality program that denies permits to dry cleaning plants unless they can prove that their emissions will not cause 300,001 instead of the normal 300,000 cancer deaths among 1 million people who will live for 70 consecutive years next door to the plant.

A "superfund" bill which has sucked billions of dollars out of taxpayers to pay lawyers to pursue "potentially responsible parties" instead of actually cleaning up toxic waste sites.

An ozone depletion scare whose purported effect—increasing incidence of dangerous ultraviolet B at ground level—turned out to be unsupported by evidence.

A global warming hysteria, based on speculative computer models instead of actual temperature data, to justify a treaty to impose federal and international taxes, rationing and prohibitions on all U.S. carbon-based energy sources.

Ludicrous requirements imposed on the nuclear energy industry, such as requiring massive concrete vaults for the storage of old coveralls and air filters whose radioactivity level a few feet from the container is less than the background radiation produced by ordinary Vermont granite.

Enforcing many of these unsupportable policies is a federal and state bureaucracy